DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 164 UD 016 565

TITLE	The EXtent and Quality of the Implementation of Grant Terms and Conditions for the Response to Educational Needs Project; Addendum [to Final Formative Evaluation Report].
INSTITUTION	Gibboney (Richard A.) Associates, Inc., Elkins Park, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	74p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Involvement; Educational Needs; Elementary School Teachers; Evaluation Criteria; Individualized Instruction; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Learning Laboratories; *Mathematics Instruction; Mathematics Teachers; Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*District of Columbia; Response to Educational Needs Project

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to provide conclusions and evidence relating to the implementation of certain grant terms and conditions negotiated between the National Institute of Education and the Response to Educational Needs Project (RENP), which were finalized on February 13, 1976. The conclusions and evidence delineated in this document focus on the Reading, Mathematics, and Parent/Community Involvement of the project. Terms and conditions pertaining to the Management component of the project are not addressed. Most of the data on which claims made in this report are based were collected between February 23 and April 23, 1976. The document is divided into three sections: a summary of the extent and quality of implementation of each grant term and condition; a lengthy explication of the extent and quality of the implementation of each grant term and condition including concommittant criteria and methods used for evaluation; and, a brief section which attempts to cross-cut the grant terms and conditions and to summarize conclusions relative to the number of schools in which RENP is fully or partially implemented. (Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131164

016565 E

RICHARD A. GIBBONEY ASSOCIATES, INC.

Consultants in Planning, Development and Evaluation

8117 Old York Road

Elkins Park, Pennsylvania 19117

RICHARD A. GIBBONEY
MICHAEL G. LANGSDORF
DONALD M. CARROLL, JR.

Tel. Philadelphia (215) CA 4-4891
(215) CA 4-4892
Suburban (215) TU 5-6040
(215) TU 5-6041

ADDENDUM

Final Formative Evaluation Report: The Extent and Quality of the Implementation of Grant Terms and Conditions For the Response to Educational Needs Project

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 016565

8. Evidence

The existing approved tests used by the TOT's are the district wide tests, the PMT and ICRT.

9. Method Criterion 5 Page 3

All laboratories were visited at least three times.

Evidence Criterion 1 Page 4

It is felt that in the one school where conditions were cramped fewer students than could normally be served had to be scheduled. Specifically, the Instructional Aide could serve anywhere from 10 to 12 students, but in fact the size of the room dictated that no more than 8 be present at any one period.

Criterion 4, Page 5

In one school the teacher sends students to labs but does not decide until Monday who shall go to the lab that week. This is considered inappropriate since the RENP plan for instruction of students specifies that there be sufficient time for the IA and TOT to plan together and this planning time be at least one week prior to the student's attending the lab.

Criterion 5, Page 6

Interviews were conducted with all IAS and TOTS. In addition, all principals were interviewed and 9 teachers were interviewed. Nineteen training sessions were observed.

12. Criteria and Methods

RENP is concerned that the math configuration program not merely be an add-on or appendage to the existing school program, but that it be fully integrated with the mathematics programs at each school. Thus, our data collection methods focused on interviewing TOTS, teachers, principals and specialists to determine the nature of the RENP mathematics program in relation to existing school program. We did not systematically collect data on the nature of the existing school programs. We did seek to determine if the RENP math staff was instructing teachers to use new methods with their own curriculum and

if there existed conflicts on the services among the specialists. The coordination of services of the various programs is the responsibility of the principal as instructional leader; five of the principals appear from our data to be active in such coordination.

13. Reviewers requested three additional pieces of information in relation to this grant term:

1. Adequacy of Procedures - We believe that the procedures used to assess employees were entirely satisfactory. We based this conclusion on the following:

a. Those aspects of employees' jobs which were assessed were discrete, had behavioral correlates, and were understood by the employees to be the basis for their evaluation.

b. The instruments which were utilized employed both observational field note data, and quantifiable judgemental data on a series of continuums. The information contained within the assessment forms was readily accessible, easy to analyze and understand, and was directly related to the behaviors being analyzed.

c. Because the evaluation is an on-going process, it is sensitive to changes in behaviors, over time.

2. How Many Interviews? - The number of interviews conducted in relation to this grant term and condition are as follows: All TOTS were interviewed; the COA was interviewed; all IAS were interviewed.

3. Number of Teacher and Principal Interviews - Ten principals were interviewed, and nine teachers were interviewed, regarding TOT and IA performance.

15. Method Criterion 4

Grant term 16 describes how a 25% sample or 370 students were originally selected to have their profiles analyzed. Additionally, 10% of this group had their learning activities compared with plans to determine the appropriateness of the learning activities themselves.

16. Criterion 1

States that almost all children will be involved in their math programs. Further evidence for this is cited in Grant Term 9, Evidence Criteria 4 and 5 found on pages 5 and 6 of the report.

19. The reviewer asked for five additional pieces of information in relation to this grant term, these are as follows:

1. Number of TOTS Interviewed - All TOTS were interviewed.

2. Time Lines - The same comments made in relation to grant term 29 are appropriate here. That is, the time lines are retroactive to January, and reflect to a certain extent, activities already under way. In our view they are realistic.

3. Interviews of Unit Task Force Members - The following unit task force members were interviewed: All principals; all TOTS; all COS; and all aides.

4. Periodic Review of Student and Teacher Profiles - The same comments made in relation to grant term 29 also obtained in this case. That is:

a. Periodically - There is no indication in most of the unit task force plans how often these profiles would be reviewed.

b. There is no indication in the unit task force plans regarding the number of such profiles that would be reviewed.

5. What does the term "remarkable" mean as used on page 40? - The term remarkable as used in this context indicates that there was a very high degree of congruente between the interview data collected from TOTS and COS regarding the monitoring performed by the principal and the principal's delineation of her/his monitoring activities.

21. Method

At each Reading Center each of the TOTS were interviewed concerning the kinds of tests that were administered on three occasions. The diagnostic test data were reviewed by the evaluators to determine which specific tests were given and all TOTS were interviewed to determine for what purpose those tests were given.

Evidence

In clarification of the term "approved test" it should be noted that the component head in Reading had approved a specific group of tests for use by the TOTS. Those tests are listed in the report. The TOTS were not allowed to use other tests than these cited without obtaining the permission of the component head.

22. The reviewers requested three additional pieces of information regarding this grant term as follows.

1. Adequacy of Procedures - The comments which we made in relation to this point for grant term 13 also hold here, as the procedures used in reading and math are virtually identical.

2. Number of Interviews - The following number of interviews were conducted: All TOTS; both TOAS; and 20 IAS were interviewed.

3. Number of Interviews with Teachers and Principals - 25 teachers were interviewed, all 10 principals were interviewed.

23. Method Criterion 4

The records on teacher training of each TOT for all of their teachers were scrutinized. The data collection plan for formative evaluation included the desire and intention of observing systematically a representative group of teachers for each TOT who had completed training in certain areas while recognizing the sensitive nature of such systematic observation by evaluators. In our initial development of a data collection plan, the consensus was reached that such systematic observation of teachers would only be undertaken when such would not jeopardize the working relationship between the TOT and the teacher. It was hoped that sufficient time and contact between the evaluators and teachers in schools would allow access to teachers' classrooms for this purpose. Such systematic observation was begun and completed on only four teachers in reading.

We acknowledge that this is an extremely small number relative to the 115 teachers being trained in reading. As mentioned in the section entitled "Has the Grant Term Been Met? Criterion 4" we further acknowledge the limited generalizability of this evidence in the area of teacher competency. The documentary data cited in this section on page 48 refers to the TOTS' records of teacher training.

Evidence Criterion 1, Page 49

All of the TOTS were interviewed and all understood these competencies were the basis of the teacher training program.

Evidence Criterion 3, Page 51

The sufficient time allowed by the TOTS for debriefing is meant to convey that the TOTS did allow at least 10 to 15 minutes at the end of each demonstration lesson to discuss with the teachers the purpose and effectiveness of the lesson.

Criterion 4, Page 52

As was previously discussed not only were TOTS' records of teacher training scrutinized, but observations were initiated for the systematic evaluation of teacher competency.

24. Criteria and Methods

A particular concern of RENP is that the reading configuration program not merely be an add-on or appendage to the existing school program, but that it be fully integrated with reading programs at each school. Thus, our data collection methods focused on interviewing TOTS, teachers, principals and specialists to determine the nature of the RENP reading program in relation to existing school programs as perceived by these people. While we do not have extensive data on the nature of the existing curriculum in each school and the Title I program in each school, we have examined the process by which the Component Head the the TOTS have worked with school personnel to initiate the RENP program in their schools. As cited in Evidence Criterion 1,

the Component Head met with the District Coordinators and with the school Principals. All TOTS met with principals at their schools also. We have verified these meetings through our discussions with each school principal. As the instructional leader of the school, the School Principal has the responsibility for the coordination of the services of each special program within the school. From our interviews with principals, it was determined that only 5 of the 10 principals of schools with reading components in place do spend considerable amount of their time engaged in the coordination of instruction or instructional programs or the monitoring of the RENP program. This was suggested in grant term 31. Thus, it would seem that in the other five schools, the coordination of the instructional programs is left mainly to the staff. The integration of RENP with other programs at these schools is wholly dependent upon the active involvment of the TOT in each school with the teachers and specialists in that school. In the five schools with principals active in program coordination, TOTS working with the school staff can be more efficacious since the burden of instructional leadership is borne by the principal. Our interviews with teachers, specialists and principals and assistant principals show quite clearly that the TOTS in all 10 schools have taken direct action and initiative to meet weekly with the specialists involved in an attempt to coordinate the services of these programs.

25. Has the Grant Term Been Met?, Criterion 1

The lack of specificity stated in the report refers to the fact that although the plan stated what was to be done, how it was to be done was not specified.

Criterion 2

When it was stated in the report that the TOTS have generated the necessary specificity in the operationalization of the plan, this was meant to convey that while the plan did not thoroughly specify how the meshing was to occur, in practice the component head has developed with the TOTS in their staff development sessions specific ways by which the TOTS may tailor the meshing

of children's skill development and functional applications to the individual teachers in that school. Thus, while there are generalizable procedures being followed, each TOT does have individual latitude in developing programs for each teacher in training to mesh skill development and application.

26. Method Criterion 4

The way in which the two sampling procedures were performed is described in Grant Term 27, wherein the students were partitioned into two categories and 25% of students' records and plans for learning activities were analyzed for each category.

In addition, a 10% sample of this group of student records were analyzed by comparing activities to objectives. Thus, 780 student's records were initially analyzed in terms of learning activities, and over 80 were analyzed thoroughly by comparing activities to objectives on two occasions, encompassing all ten schools.

Criterion 1, Page 61: Erratum-PMT should read PRT.

Method Criterion 4

The analysis to determine the appropriateness of activities to plans entailed (1) reviewing the plans which were based on the diagnostic tests data and (2) reviewing and observing the learning activities to determine if they did address the specific objectives of the learning plans. If those activities did directly address those objectives the activity was deemed appropriate.

27. In response to the Project Officer's concern that students be observed and the data reported, as was mentioned under Grant Term 30, on three occasions each center was observed to determine the nature of the instruction being provided to students. On each of those occasions the instruction being provided the students by the aides was observed and individual profiles and plans of several of the instructed students were examined to determine the appropriateness of the learning activity being undertaken. In all cases the evaluators deemed that the instruction being provided was appropriate for the diagnosis.

28. Method

The basic observational strategy for the Reading Centers in this grant term is described in Grant Term 30. The centers were observed to determine the adequacy of facilities and materials and the centers' usage by children and teachers. All TOTS were interviewed to explain the physical set-up and schedule of services and how the materials were being used. Activities on-going during the observational period were crossed checked with the planned scheduled activities for each center during that time period.

Evidence

The proposed central teaching center in the RENP Continuation Proposal was to be a center wherein teachers from the region would come to receive instructional improvement through sessions with TOTS. That central teachers' center is not operational, however, at McZogney Annex there is a central resource center for instructional materials which the TOTS use.

29. The reviewers wished five additional pieces of information in relation to this grant term, these were as follows:

1. Number of TOTS Interviewed - All TOTS were interviewed.

2. We reported one of the common project objectives that recurred across unit task force plans. Two questions were raised by the reviewer.

a. In the hypothetical instance cited by the reviewer "does this mean that the student is only required to master five?" It is our understanding that this is the case, since 50% mastery is the criterion used for this grant term.

b. Why is the ICRT used? - The statement which we made in our report is in error, for "ICRT" you should read "PRT".

3. Time Lines - In our view, the January to May time line is realistic in that, even though the plans were submitted late, the activities did begin in January. Thus in part, the plans were retroactive. Further, it is our belief that the plans were careful to stipulate only activities which had a realistic chance of occurring during those five months.

4. Interviews with Unit Task Force Members - The following numbers of unit task force members were interviewed: All principals; and TOTS; all COS; and 20 aides.

5. Periodic Review of Student and Teacher Profiles - The reviewer raised two points for our response regarding this aspect of the grant term and condition.

a. What is meant by periodically? - Most of the reports did not stip[illegible] what they meant by periodic review. One of the reports however, indicated that such profiles would be reviewed monthly.

b. Number of Student and Teacher Profiles to be Reviewed - Again, the reports did not stipulate a specific number of student and teacher profiles which would be reviewed.

30. Evidence, Criterion 5, Page 76

The examination of profiles and plans refers to the analysis and examination performed in Grant Term 27. The IAS and TOTS interviewed refer to all TOTS and 20 IAS. Further, all TOTS and principals were interviewed as well as 25 teachers.

32. Method Criterion 2

It is stated that the director was interviewed regularly, this should be interpreted to mean weekly.

Criterion 3

Two meetings were held to review, devise and modify the specific milestones in monitoring criteria. Both meetings were attended by the evaluator, three members of the ACSB were in attendance at both meetings and they reviewed the finalized milestones and the evaluation methods. This information is also relevant to Evidence Criterion 3, page 82. These members of the ACSB were considered appropriate as they were the chairpersons of three committees.

33. Method Criterion 3, Page 87

All 10 Community Organizers, two Senior Community Organizers, and three staff members of the Information Dissemination and Resource Center were interviewed.

Criterion 4

All 10 Community Organizers and two Senior Community Organizers were interviewed. In addition, four randomly chosen Community Organizers were selected to be observed in their daily activities for two consecutive days. During that time, the activities in which they were engaged were recorded and compared to their job descriptions to ascertain if they were in fact performing duties in accordance with their roles.

Criterion 6

All weekly activity reports of each Community Organizer were reviewed. All 10 Community Organizers and two Senior Community Organizers were interviewed.

Evidence Criterion 1, Page 88

Personnel folders of members of the PCI staff were reviewed. Interviews were conducted with all Community Organizers, two Senior Community Organizers, and three staff members of the IDRC.

Criterion 3

Interview results indicated that 13 of the 15 staff members interviewed felt that they previous training they had received did provide appropriate skills. In addition, 10 of the 15 interviewed indicated a desire for training in report writing, these were the 10 Community Organizers.

Criterion 5, Page 89

All 15 principals were interviewed. In addition, two principals, two Local School Board Chairpersons, 8 School Board members and three parents were interviewed. The parents indicated that the CO was well known to them and they were well aware of her operation in the school. That is, they could cite specific examples of activities the CO was engaged in and noted frequent

contact with the CO.

34. Method Criterion 1

The phrase "requisite elements" refers to those items listed under Critera 1.

36. Method Criterion 1

The RENP officials who were interviewed include the Director, the Public Information Officer, and the PCI staff member responsible for the IDRC.

Criterion 3

There are 3 IDRC staff members.

Evidence Criterion 1, Page 97

The local residents interviewed concerning the IDRC services were five people who used the referral service during a one week period in April.

Criterion 2

The PCI officials maintain that the unique function provided by RENP'S IDRC is that it is a conduit for referrals of information for service to other community agencies and as such, anyone may use it to get information on problems that are related to any agency in the area. The PCI officials referred to in Criterion 2 are the Director of RENP, the Public Information Officer and the staff member responsible for the IDRC.

37. The reviewers sought clarification of the following three points:

1. What does the term "PCI took pains" mean? - As used in this context, this term means that the developers of the seven plans to which reference is made in this statement were very careful to relate PCI objectives to overall project-related objectives. That is, the developers of these seven plans made sure that the support objectives delineated for PCI would facilitate the accomplishment of project objectives in general.

2. What does the term "exemplary" as used on page 100 mean? - The term exemplary as used in this context, refers to those seven unit task force plans which had carefully delineated activities and objectives for the PCI component.

These can be contrasted to the other schools which, while they did have some activities delineated for PCI, were not nearly as specific as those to which we referred as exemplary.

3. What does the term "frequent" as used on page 102 mean? - As used in this context, the term frequent should be construed as meaning that the community organizers make regular visits to homes. In our view, most of these visits occur on an as-needed basis, and the actual number of such visits varies in proportion to that need.

RICHARD A. GIBBONEY ASSOCIATES, INC.

Consultants in Planning, Development and Evaluation

8117 Old York Road

Elkins Park, Pennsylvania 19117

RICHARD A. GIBBONEY
MICHAEL G. LANGSDORF
DONALD M. CARROLL, JR.

Tel. Philadelphia (215) CA 4-4891
(215) CA 4-4892
Suburban (215) TU 5-6040
(215) TU 5-6041

013

UP

Final Formative Evaluation Report:
The Extent and Quality of the Implementation of Grant Terms and Conditions
For the Response to Educational Needs Project

Prepared for: The National Institute of Education, Education and Work Division;
Pursuant to Contract Number 400-76-0056

Note: The conclusions reflected herein represent the views of the authors, and not necessarily those of the National Institute of Education.

UD 016565

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report with to extend their deep thanks to the staff of RENP for giving so unstintingly of their time and effort in helping us to better understand the project. We are especially grateful to Mr. William Rice, Mr. Gene Kinlow, Mr. Daniel Jackson, Dr. Helen Truner, Ms. Mary Johnson, Ms. Pearl Montague and Ms. Rowena Spivey for their candor and time. Special thanks to Ms. Jeannette Henderson for typing the manuscript. From the National Institute of Education, special thanks to George Sealey for helping us grasp the history and development of the project. We thank Lois-ellin Datta for her constant support and feedback. Finally, we gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Mr. Howard Lesnick, Project Officer for Evaluation, without whose undersanding, wisdom, and insight this report could not have been prepared.

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide conclusions and evidence relating to the implementation of certain grant terms and conditions negotiated between the National Institute of Education and the Response to Educational Needs Project which were finalized on February 13, 1976. The conclusions and evidence delineated in this document pertain to grant terms and condition numbers eight through thirty-seven, and focus upon the Reading, Mathematics and Parent/Community Involvement components of the project. Terms and conditions pertaining to the Management component of the project are not addressed herein. Most of the data on which claims made in this report are based were collected between February 23 and April 23, 1976. Data were collected pursuant to the "Formative Evaluation Design/RENP", developed by the evaluators and modified through inputs provided from the National Institute of Education and the Response to Educational Needs Project.

Contents of the Report:

The remainder of this document is divided into three sections: a summmary of the extent and quality of implementation of each grant term and condition; a lengthy explication of the extent and quality of the implementation of each grant term and condition including concomittant criteria and methods used for evaluation; and finally, a brief section which attempts to cross-cut the grant terms and conditions and to summarize conclusions relative to the number of schools in which RENP is fully or partially implemented. The bulk of this document is comprised of the middle section which speaks to the degree and quality of implementation. The format utilized in organizing that section is presented below:

- o Grant Term and Condition: Each grant term and condition is considered separately. This section repeats the grant terms and conditions verbatim; as they appeared on the final list negotiated between the Institute and the project. Each grant term and condition is numbered according to its placement on that list.

- Criteria: For each grant term and condition the criteria which were used as standards for its evaluation are listed. These criteria were derived conjointly by the evaluators, the National Institute of Education, and The Response to Educational Needs Project.

- Method: The evaluation strategies used to collect data relative to each of the criteria are described. These methods were developed conjointly by the evaluators, the National Institute of Education and the Response to Educational Needs Project.

- Has the Grant Term Been Met?: This subsection, which appears for each grant term and condition, summarizes the degree of implementation for each of the criteria. In most cases the quality of the implementation of each criterion is also discussed. Some of the criteria however, do not call for qualitative judgments. In such cases only the extent of implementation is discussed.

- Evidence: This section, which is included for each grant term and condition, summarizes the data in relation to each criterion which substantiate claims made in the subsection described above. Wherever possible, the evidence section stipulates appropriate numbers regarding given data sets (i.e. a given percentage of teachers contended that "X" was the case; or a certain phenomonon was observed in "X" percent of the schools). Names of specific schools and/or individuals are not cited.

The reader will note, in perusing this report, that for many of the grant terms and conditions there are several criteria relating to extent of implementation and degree of quality. When multiple criteria are involved, the evidence often reflects "mixed" results for a given grant term. For example, if there are four criteria for a certain grant term, it may be that criterion one has been met with high quality at all schools; that criterion two has been partially met, with varying degrees of quality at all schools; that criterion three has been met with high quality for some schools and has not been met at all in others; and that criterion four has not been met at any school. The evaluators have made no attempt to weight the importance of the criteria in relation to each other. Therefore, in the case of "mixed" results, we leave it to the reader to decide if the number of criteria which have been met, and the degree and quality of their implementation is acceptable.

SUMMARY OF THE EXTENT AND

QUALITY OF EACH GRANT TERM AND CONDITION

MATH COMPONENT

8. Use existing diagnostic instruments

One criterion was used and was fully met. Therefore, the grant term was fully met.

9. Stabilized program at 10 schools for children

Give criteria were used. Two were fully met, and the remaining three were partially met (fully met at nine of ten schools, another criterion was fully met at seven of ten schools and the remaining criterion was fully met at eight of ten schools). Thus, the grant term has been partially met. Two of these criteria necessitated qualitative judgements. One was fully met with high quality. The remaining one has been fully met with high quality at eight of ten schools.

10. Operational program at 10 schools for teachers

Three criteria were used. Two criteria were fully met, and one criterion was partially met (fully met at eight of ten schools). The grant term, therefore was partially met. One criterion necessitated qualitative judgement; it was fully met with high quality.

11. Plan to mesh skill development and application

Two criteria were used. Both of these criteria necessitated a qualitative judgement: both have been fully met with high quality. Thus, the grant term has been fully met.

12. Plan to integrate RENP with schools

Two criteria were used. Both necessitated qualitative judgements and were fully met with high quality; the grant term, therefore, has been fully met.

13. Assessment of staff competency

Five criteria were used. All five necessitated qualitative judgements and have been fully met with high quality. Thus, the grant term has been fully met.

14. Assessment of teachers

Four criteria were used. All four necessitated qualitative judgements: two criteria have been fully met with high quality, and two have been partially met with high quality (fully met at seven of ten schools; the other has been partially met and reflected by limited data). As a whole, the grant term has been partially met.

15. Assessment of students

Four criteria were identified. Three of these criteria have been fully met and one criterion was been partially met (fully met at eight of ten schools). Overall, the grant term has been partially met.

16. Most children accommodated

Two criteria were used. Both criteria necessitated qualitative judgements: both were fully met with high quality at nine of ten schools. Therefore, the grant term was partially met.

17. Focus on enabling objectives

One criterion was used and was fully met; the grant term has been fully met.

18. Use existing materials

One criterion was used and was fully met; the grant term was fully met.

19. Unit task force plans

Six criteria were employed. Five criteria necessitated qualitative judgements: all have been fully met with high quality. In addition, the remaining criterion has been fully met; therefore, the grant term has been fully met.

READING COMPONENT

20. No new curriculum development

One criterion was used and was fully met; the grant term was fully met.

21. Use existing diagnostic instruments

One criterion was used and was fully met; the grant term was fully met.

22. Assessment of staff competency

Five criteria were used. All necessitated qualitative judgements and have been fully met with high quality. Therefore, the grant term has been fully met.

23. Assessment of teachers

Four criteria were used. All necessitated qualitative judgements: two were fully met with high quality and two were partially met with high quality (fully met at eight of ten schools; the other has been partially met as reflected by limited data). Thus, the grant term, as a whole, was partially met.

24 Plan to integrate RENP with schools

Two criteria were used. Both necessitated qualitative judgements: both were fully met with high quality. Therefore, the grant term was fully met.

25. Plan to mesh skill development and application

Two criteria were used, and both necessitated qualitative judgements. One

has been met, but not at high quality. The other one has been fully met with high quality. Hence, the grant term, as a whole, has been partially met.

26. Assessment of students

Four criteria were used: three have been fully met and one has been partially met (fully met at seven of ten schools). Therefore, the grant term , as a whole, has been partially met.

27. All children accommodated

Two criteria were used. Both required qualitative judgements and have been fully met with high quality. Therefore, the grant term has been fully met.

28. Focus on enabling objectives

A single criterion was used and was fully met. Therefore, the grant term has been fully met.

29. Unit task force plans

Six criteria were used and were fully met. Thus, the grant term was fully met.

30. Stabilized program at 10 schools for children

Five criteria were used. One criterion has been partially met (fully met at seven of ten schools). The remaining four criteria necessitated qualitative judgements: two have been fully met at high quality, one has been met but not at high quality, and the fourth has been partially met with high quality (fully met with high quality at seven of ten schools). Therefore, the grant term as a whole has been partially met.

31. Operational program at 10 schools for teachers

Three criteria were used. One criterion has been fully met, and another has been partially met (fully met at seven of ten schools). The remaining criterion necessitated a qualitative judgement: it has been fully met with high quality. The grant term, as a whole, has been partially met.

PARENT/COMMUNITY COMPONENT

32. Assistant Director; ACSB and local school board milestones

Five criteria were utilized. Two criteria have been fully met, one has not been met, and two have been partially met. We conclude: that the grant term in general has been partially met.

33. Assessment of staff

Six criteria were enumerated. Five of these criteria have been fully met, and one has been partially met. We find, therefore, that overall the grant term has been partially met.

34. ACSB and local school board competency profiles

Two criteria were used. Neither of these criteria have been met and therefore the grant term has not been met.

35. Businesses, agencies and institutions

Four criteria were used. Two have been fully met and two have been partially met. Therefore, the grant term, as a whole, has been partially met.

36. Community referral service

Two criteria were utilized. Both criteria have been fully met, therefore, the grant term has been fully met.

37. Unit task force plans

Two criteria were used and both necessitated qualitative judgements. These criteria have been fully met with high quality by seven schools; have been fully met with lesser quality by seven schools, and has not been met by one school. Thus, in gneral, the grant term has been partially met.

EXPLICATION AND EXAMINATION

OF GRANT TERMS AND CONDITIONS

8. RENP will select and use existing diagnostic instruments in mathemetics rather than developing new ones. Informal tests designed to facilitate day-to-day classroom work will be permitted.

Criterion

TOTs will use only existing diagnostic tests.

Method

To determine if the criterion has been met, inspections of diagnostic test data and interviews of TOTs were conducted.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

This grant term has been fully met.

Evidence

Existing approved tests are used by all TOTs. These include the ICRT and PMT. In addition, one TOT used the standardized Mathematics Level Test. Also, sections of certain other standardized tests are used for checking mastery of skills by students.

9. Implementation for the mathematics component will begin on January 1, 1976 with the understanding that all 10 schools stated in the continuation proposal will have in place high quality, stabilized program servicing children. This condition will constitute consideration at the April 26, 1976 program assessment.

Criteria

1. Space and facilities for laboratories provided by schools will be adequate.
2. The labs will be fully stocked with instructional material.
3. The materials will be cross-referenced to appropriate objectives.
4. Children from each teacher's class will be scheduled for instruction in the laboratory and served in accordance with the schedule.
5. Instruction of students in the lab by IAs and in the classroom by TOTs will be of high quality:
   - IAs' instruction will reinforce skills for appropriate objectives, evaluate learning, and record mastery.
   - TOTs will plan for lab instruction by IAs, coordinate lab and classroom instruction with teachers, plan and execute with teachers classroom instruction to introduce or reinforce skills, evaluate learning, record mastery and coordinate all student learning and mastery with teachers.

Method

Criteria (1-4) All laboratories were observed at least three times (once per month) for evidence of the adequacy of facilities, and materials, the cross referencing of materials and each lab's usage by children. All TOTs and IAs were interviewed on these occasions to explain the physical set-up and schedule of services. Materials and their cross-referencing were closely examined to ascertain the accuracy of cross-referencing and to form a general opinion of the quality of the materials in use.

Criterion (5) On each visit to labs the instruction of students by the IA was observed and on each occasion several students were "instructed" (e.g., talked with concerning their lab assignment to ascertain their understanding of the material which should be of a reinforcing nature). After such contact with students their individual profiles and plans were examined (for further discussion of the profiles and plans see grant term 15) to determine the appropriateness of the learning activity and to form a general opinion of the accuracy of the diagnosis. The recording of student mastery was also noted. Further, the IA in each lab was interviewed concerning the specific instruction performed and the procedures for planning and executing instruction and for evaluating learning and recording mastery.

On each visit to the lab we had at least a brief opportunity to talk to the TOTs to corroborate information from the IAs concerning the labs' operation. In addition, each TOT was observed in 19 training sessions with teachers which provided an opportunity to check on the process of coordinating instruction and learning mastery with teachers. Also, each TOT was interviewed on several occasions concerning the total service program at each school.

To provide corroborative evidence of the nature of the service to children at each school the principals and/or vice principals were interviewed. Also, at least one teacher working with each TOT was interviewed. In total, nine teachers were interviewed, covering eight schools (two-thirds of the six TOTs split schools and for two of them we could not arrange an interview with a teacher at one of their schools).

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

Criterion (1) has been fully met in nine schools and not met in one school.

Criterion (2) has been fully met.

Criterion (3) has been fully met at seven schools and partially met at three schools.

Criterion (4) has been fully met at eight schools with high quality, met with lesser quality at one school, and only partially met at lesser quality at one school.

Criterion (5) has been fully met at high quality in all schools.

Evidence

Criterion (1) In the ten schools we found that nine of the ten labs were operating in classrooms provided by the school. In the other school the lab is operating in a former storage room; conditions are cramped and fewer students than the IA could serve must be scheduled as a result.

Criterion (2) In all ten schools we found the labs to be fully stocked with materials, the range of which adequately covers the laboratory approach in the topic areas of the D.C.P.S. curriculum. Most of the materials come from Creative Teaching Associates and are already indexed to objectives by topic area.

Criterion (3) The laboratory materials from Creative Teaching Associates are indexed to objectives which permit their effective use in each topic by TOT and teachers. Additional material in the labs did require indexing, however. Five TOTs had been shifted from their intended schools and found that they had indexed their materials to the wrong set of objectives (i.e., the new school had administered the PMT when the TOT had indexed materials to the ICRT or vice versa). Also some schools had administered both sets of tests to different groups of students. The PMT was constructed to correspond exactly to D.C.P.S. objectives, so that indexing to PMT skill levels is tantamount to indexing to D.C.P.S. objectives. The ICRT objectives do not follow the same sequence as the D.C.P.S. objectives.

In February, when the formative evaluators began data collection, TOTs were in the process of indexing materials to objectives at each laboratory. The TOTs collaborated on a mastery correlation of ICRT and PMT objectives which would permit easy cross-referencing. This process is very nearly completed. The TOTs in seven schools have all material indexed in the topic areas being addressed by teachers this year and additional material indexed to ICRT so that when the correlation is completed this cross-referencing will be straightforward. In the other three schools approximately 60% of the materials, by our sampling, is appropriatley indexed.

Criterion (4) In eight of the schools students are scheduled from the class of each RENP teacher into the lab on a regular basis and the teacher, TOT, and IA know a week or more in advance which students are coming on which days. Thus, they can select learning activities based upon those students' individual learning plans. In one school, although each teacher sends students to the lab daily, the teacher decides on Monday who will go that week and the IA soes not know who is coming until they appear. Planning for instruction is done by the TOT and IA on Monday while the students engage in gaming or manipulative activities. We do not judge this scheduling procedure as appropriate. In the remaining school, considerable scheduling confusion ensued for over a month when not all teachers nor their students were regularly scheduled for the laboratory.

Criterion (5) Our observation of the instructional performance of the IAs indicated that all were reinforcing skills, not introducing new ones (the TOTs' or teachers' responsibility) through skillful teaching activities. While there was some variability among aides, all were judged competent and several to be extremely competent (in fact, their teaching was as good or better in the reinforcing activities than that of teachers). The IAs appear to be not aides in the usual sense, but highly trained specialists in a narrow range of instructional activities.

From the interaction with students and the examination of their profiles and plans, the instruction provided was deemed appropriate. Also, in evidence were tests evaluating learning and records of mastery at each school. The procedures were uniformly carried out by the IAs.

Interviews were conducted with IAs and TOTs. Data from the two sources are congruent in indicating that IAs and TOTs plan together for the IAs' instruction. We never observed any planning sessions, which usually occur after school, as it was this time that was used for interviews. However, one IA was observed planning for her students when the TOT was absent; although, IAs are ostensibly not supposed to plan, this occasion obviously merited some role flexibility.

The interaction of TOT and teachers in terms of coordinating learning activities and evaluation was assessed via observing the training sessions and interviews with TOTs, teachers, and principals. The demonstration lessons taught by TOTs were well-executed. The planning sessions observed did evidence the desired coordination and interviews cooroborated that weekly or biweekly coordinated evaluation occurs. Particularly in evidence was the updating of all test data; though tests were administered in September, teachers and TOTs systematically updated the data on levels of student learning for the Spring through teachers' analyses and check tests in the areas of the curriculum treated.

10. It is expected that all proposed labs and centers for Mathematics training will be operational and servicing teachers by April 26, 1976. Further, all teachers in need of training should have completed training by April 26, 1976. This condition will be considered as a criteria for program continuance at that decision point. The number of labs and centers will be the number stated in the accepted proposal of December, 1975.

Criteria

1. The ten laboratories for Mathematics training will be operational and servicing teachers.

2. Teacher training scheduled through April 26, 1976 shall have been completed.

3. Teacher training completed shall have addressed the areas of teachers' most needed skills from the RENP competence criteria in the teaching of mathematics.

Method

Criterion (1) The operation and service of the laboratories was assessed through the observation of 19 training sessions in the ten schools involving 13 teachers (or 15% of the 85 teachers).

Criterion (2) The accomplishment of scheduled teacher training was assessed through the scrutiny of all TOTs' files on each of their teachers and an examination of all TOTs' weekly reports on activities to the component head.

Criterion (3) The addressing of the areas of teachers' most needed skills was assessed though interviews with all TOTs, all principals or assistant principals, and a sample of teachers randomly selected and stratified by TOT (9 teachers or 11% of the 82 teachers).

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

Criterion (1) has been fully met.

Criterion (2) has been fully met in eight schools and partially met in two schools.

Criterion (3) has been fully met with a high degree of quality.

Evidence

Criterion (1) From reports of the scheduled usage of centers for teacher training and student instruction, observation days were randomly chosen. We found all ten centers to be servicing teachers. One was suffering under adverse conditions in terms of facilities, but the training proceeded nevertheless.

Criterion (2) From scrutinizing TOTs' files on each teacher and weekly reports, we have determined that, with the exceptions of teacher illness or pregnancy or TOT illness, all teachers received training as scheduled in seven schools. In two schools two and three teachers have not been attending scheduled training sessions; in the remaining school, teachers were improperly scheduled, in our opinion, so that some would receive training on an as-needed basis only. Thus, at this school only those teachers whom the TOT believed needed training were served. Our understanding of RENP however, is that all teachers are to receive service.

In relating criterion (1) to criterion (2), we found that in all observed training sessions, the teachers who were scheduled did attend, with the exceptions of those on leave. We did find, in addition, one instance when a TOT cancelled the day's training at one school in order to keep a lab open at her other school when the lab manager was ill; we sought clarification of RENP policy on priorities and were told by the component head that the training of teachers has priority over the lab service to students and such cancelling of training should not have occured. No

other incident of this kind was observed.

Criterion (3) In their interviews the TOTs all stated that the negotiated training plans reflected a synthesis of teachers' felt needs and TOTs' perception of teacher needs. Of note is that initially none of the teachers was very familiar with the laboratory approach or the RENP learning sequence. Therefore, training in mathematics was quite uniform in procedure with variations of teachers' curricula and content knowledge. All nine interviewed teachers stated that the TOT was working with them on what they considered to be most important areas.

11. By January 15, a detailed plan for training teachers to mesh childrens' skill development and application will be prepared; by March 1st the plan will be implemented.

Criteria

1. A detailed plan for training teachers to mesh childrens' skill development and functional applications will have been prepared.

2. The plan shall be implemented; TOTs shall be training teachers:
   - to diagnose individual student skills
   - to group students of similar needs for instruction
   - to plan instruction for groups and individuals based upon diagnosis
   - to teach skills within an applied context in the regular mathematics period and in the content areas (e.g., science and business).

Method

1. The plan that was submitted was reviewed to determine if it addressed the meshing of skill development and application in teacher training.

2. The implementation of the training plan was assessed through the interviewing of all TOTs and a sample of 9 teachers (11% of the 85 teachers) and through observation of 19 training sessions.

Has the Grant Term Meen Met?

Criterion (1) has been fully met at high quality.

Criterion (2) has been fully met at high quality.

Evidence

Criterion (1) The submitted plan describes the basic format of RENP teacher training in mathematics. It contains the five stage learning sequence which teachers will be trained to use via the laboratory approach with their students. A full explication of these stages was not contained in the report but was provided to the evaluators by RENP, reproduced from the reference cited in the report or plan. The process of teacher training was described in the plan, delineating training procedures for teachers in each of the five stages. The fifth stage of this sequence is Application (as stipulated in this grant term) in which the teacher specifically promotes the transfer of skill development to other contexts through "experience in applications in a variety of situations".

Criterion (2) The TOTs are employing the five stage learning sequence in their training of teachers through the laboratory approach. In interviews, all six TOTs expressed that it was important to help teachers appreciate the necessity of moving beyond the fourth stage of "Fixing Skills" (the reinforcement of learning). In the eleven training sessions observed, all TOTs stressed the importance of each of the five stages and their interrelation; application was clearly an integral part of the training as teachers were helped to plan lessons with such in mind.

It was noted that over half of the training sessions observed (6 of 11) dealt either with familiarizing the teacher with the five stages or with helping them to interpret the criterion-reference test data (in the first learning stage) using these data as a basis for instruction. The other five sessions were devoted to specific lesson planning with materials and ideas to incorporate the laboratory approach. The data from teachers' interviews, which showed that all elementary teachers had expressed needs in content areas in mathematics, and the content of the above-described training sessions lead us to conclude that the TOTs are teaching

the necessity of meshing skill development and applications. However, the focus of the teachers' interest as self-perceived needs, is on more basic concerns (e.g., diagnosis, lesson planning, and subject matter content).

12. By February 1, a detailed plan which describes the process of integrating RENP's math "configuration/program" with the existing math programs (DCPS, Title I, for example) at each school will be developed. By March 1, it will be implemented.

Criteria

1. A detailed plan which describes the process of integrating RENP's math "configuration/program" with existing math programs at each school will have been developed.

2. The plan will have been implemented:
   - develop the use of the laboratory approach to the teaching of mathematics with the teachers' ongoing curriculum for student instruction and teacher training
   - coordinate services at each school with the other specialists (Title I and resource teachers)
   - serve grade levels not addressed by Title I

Methods

Criterion (1) The submitted plan was reviewed to determine what specific actions were to be taken in schools.

Criterion (2) Nineteen training sessions with teachers were observed; all TOTs, nine teachers, all principals and/or assistant principals, and two math resource teachers were interviewed.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

The grant term has been fully met at high quality.

Evidence

Criterion (1) The submitted plan contains a description of the programs and personnel

at each school and details what actions the TOT will be performing.

Criterion (2) The observed training sessions indicated that RENP does not have its own curriculum at these schools but uses the existing curriculum of each teacher in the training for the laboratory approach. The student plans and teachers' lesson plans which are developed with the TOT were all shown to be based upon the D.C.P.S. curricular topics currently taught by the teachers. The interviews with both teachers and TOTs confirmed these observations.

Interviews with principals confirmed the information contained in the submitted plan as to the programs and personnel operating in their schools. Specifically, RENP does not work with teachers participating in Title I. In interviews with both principals and two math resource teachers all stated that TOTs regularly meet with the specialists to discuss ways to coordinate their service to teachers.

13. By February 1, almost every employee of the math component will have been evaluated/assessed for competency in teaching math. Incompetent personnel will be dismissed. By March 1, others will have received intensive training to bring them up to speed. The personnel records will show that this was done. Periodic checks to ensure competence is maintained should be apparent in personnel folder. TOTs, TOAs, and IAs will know what they are doing, their activities will make educational sense, they will know why they are conducting various activities, and perform them with high levels of competence.

Criteria

1. Almost every employee of the mathematics component will have been evaluated/assessed for competency in teaching mathematics.

2. Personnel will have received training for the purpose of improvement in areas of deficiency.

3. Personnel training shall have been recorded and periodically updated.

4. TOTs, COA, and IAs will fully understand the activities of their roles.

5. TOTs, COA, and IAs will perform their required activities with high levels of competence.

Method

Criteria (1 and 3) Ther personnel folders of all the TOTs, COA, and IAs were reviewed, and the Director of the Mathematics Component was interviewed.

Criterion (2) The training of the RENP math staff was observed in four staff development sessions of TOTs and COA and three training sessions of IAs.

Criterion (4) All TOTs, COA, and IAs were interviewed to assess their understanding of their roles as described in the "Training Programs" document.

Criterion (5) All TOTs were observed in 19 training sessions with teachers. The COA was observed in 3 training sessions with aides. All IAs were observed instructing students in the labs. In addition, 9 teachers and all 10 principals and/or assistant principals were interviewed.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

All criteria have been fully met with a high degree of quality.

Evidence

Criterion (1) Completed Staff Assessment Forms were observed for all TOTs, COA, and IAs in the Mathematics Component.

Criteria (2 and 3) Training plans exist for all TOTs, COA, and IAs, For TOTs and COA these plans specifically addressed the skills measured by the various assessment instruments, and included a description of the area in which work was needed, and at least one course for remediating weaknesses. Individualized Training Plans existed for each of the IAs, and each Training Plan was calibrated to the results of the staff assessment. The Individualized Training Plans for all TOTs, COA, and IAs are updated monthly, and evidence of such updating such as certification of skills in which a TOT, a COA, or an IA was initially judged deficient were immediately apparent. The observed training sessions were commensurate with the training plans.

Criterion (4) A document entitled "Training Program/Mathematics Component/RENP" clearly specifies those activities to be performed by TOTs, COA, and IAs, along with reasons for conducting these activities. Second, all employees in the Mathematics Component are required to review their monthly assessment ratings as evidenced by the fact that all the rating sheets had been countersigned by employees. Third, interviews conducted with TOTs, COA, and IAs substantiated that they are

cognizant of activities they are to perform, and the reasons for conducting various activities.

Criterion (5) All of the mathematics TOTs were observed training teachers on two occasions (excepting one TOT who was seen only once due to illness). In all cases we concluded that TOTs were performing at high levels of competence. For a detailed discussion of this latter point, the reader is referred to grant term 14.

The performance of the COA was also judged to be at a high level of competence as evidenced by our visits to three training sessions the COA conducted for IAs.

Observations of all of the IAs indicate that they are performing their jobs competently and in accordance with their job descriptions. A further discussion of the quality of the performance of IAs appears in the description of grant term 9.

Finally, the interview data from discussions with teachers and principals, indicate that the TOTs and the IAs are performing their jobs competently.

14. By February 1, almost all teachers (estimated 84) will have been assessed for their strengths/weaknesses in teaching math. An individual teacher learning plan will be developed, showing what activities will be undertaken to bring teachers close to 100% competency. By March 1, most teachers will have been trained. With regard to their math activities in the classrooms, they will know what they are doing re math, why they are doing this, and show high levels of competency in implementing activities.

Criteria

1. RENP will have developed criteria for the competency in the teaching of mathematics which will be used as a basis for the assessment of teachers and for their training. The criteria should be logical, specific, and understood by the TOTs to provide such a basis.

2. The assessment of teachers' skills will have been completed on almost all teachers and will have been performed in a standard and formal manner with instruments/procedures logically derived from the competency criteria.

3. The training of teachers will have been done in accordance with the training plans at a high quality:

-- theory sessions will move from theory into practice including not only stimulating concepts and ideas but also specific teaching strategies, technique and materials designed to foster instructional improvement in the RENP competency criteria areas.

-- demonstration lessons by TOTs will be of high quality, exemplifying the skills in which teachers are being trained (i.e., the competency criteria) and include appropriate debriefing (feedback) with teachers.

-- TOTs and teachers will engage in planning for teachers' new instruction, fostering instructional improvement in the RENP competency criteria areas.

-- TOTs will observe teachers' demonstrating new skills through regular classroom observation.

-- TOTs will record the training/staff development activities of the teachers (i.e., modules completed) and instructional improvement demonstrated and will encourage teachers' self-evaluation.

4. The teachers will be aware of their instructional improvement in the teaching of mathematics, will demonstrate competency in the areas of their RENP training, and will have positive attitudes towards their continued instructional improvement.

Method

Criterion (1) Competency criteria which RENP requires of teachers in the personalized approach to Mathematics instruction were reviewed.

Criterion (2) The process by which teachers' skills and/or needs were assessed was analyzed through the review of instruments, the scrutiny of all TOTs' files on each of their teachers, and the examination of all TOTs' weekly reports on activities to the component director.

Criterion (3) The process by which teachers were trained was analyzed through scrutiny of all TOTs' files on each of their teachers, through observation of 19 training sessions (11 theory/feedback/planning sessions and 8 demonstration lessons) involving 13 teachers (or 15% of the 85 teachers) in the ten schools.

Criterion (4) The instructional improvement of teachers and their attitudes towards training were assessed through interviews with 9 teachers (or 11% of the 85 teachers a random sample, stratified by TOT), through interviews with the principals of all ten schools, by scrutiny of TOT records on teacher training activities and by observation of the teaching of two classroom teachers.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

Criterion (1) has been fully met with a high degree of quality.

Criterion (2) has been fully met in seven of the schools, with a high degree of quality. The other three schools have only partially met this criterion although what was done showed high quality.

Criterion (3) has been fully met at all schools with a high degree of quality.

Criterion (4) is judged upon limited evidence. As reflected in the formative evaluation plan, the assessment of teacher competence with classroom observation might not be fully realized; more observations were planned and desired but only two could be scheduled. The interview and documentary data do suggest strongly that progress in performance and positive changes in attitude have been affected by the project. The extent of change in teachers' performance remains in question.

Evidence

Criterion (1) The following competency criteria have been developed by RENP for the teaching of mathematics:

-- teachers will be able to use diagnostic/prescriptive teaching (i.e., will be able to administer and analyze diagnostic tests, construct a behavioral hierarchy for a given topic, teach an individual student or groups of students with similar needs following the five stage learning sequence of RENP math component, teach students with learning disabilities in mathematics, provide individualized instruction for classes)

-- teachers will be able to establish learning centers in their classrooms.

-- teachers will be able to use the laboratory approach and the discovery method in teaching in the stages of the learning sequence

-- teachers will be able to mesh students' skill development and application

-- teachers will be able to teach a topic using a variety of methods

These criteria are logical and specific, in light of RENP's goals. All TOTs interviewed understood that these competencies were the basis of the teacher training program.

Criterion (2) The RENP Mathematics TOTs sent Letters of Inquiry (a teacher self-assessment form) to all 85 teachers. The form explicitly states the competency criteria (with the exception of meshing development and application) to teachers and asks teachers to indicate their knowledge/performance of them on seven specific teaching activities. An additional seventeen content areas (including applications) are to be similarly rated for needs by the teachers. At seven of the ten schools all teachers completed this form; in the remaining three schools 5 of 6 (63%), 3 of 7 (43%), and 12 of 16 (75%) did complete the form.

The TOT followed up the Letter of Inquiry with an individual conference with each teacher to plan for the TOT to observe the teacher and his/her class during instruction. After this observation they again conferred to develop a mutually agreeable set of training areas - the specific teaching skills to be addressed in training and the teacher's curriculum in which he/she would be learning to teach through the laboratory approach and the learning stages. The weekly reports submitted by the TOTs to the component head were reviewed by the formative evaluators. They indicated all TOTs both observed and conferred with all teachers in 9 of 10 schools.

From the above negotiations between TOT and teachers, individual profiles of areas of needed training were to be drawn. In evidence to the formative evaluators were such prodiles for all teachers in seven schools; in the remaining three schools 5 of 6 (63%), 4 of 7 (57%), and 13 of 16 (81%) were found completed.

On the basis of the individual teacher profiles training plans were to be developed which scheduled the training of each teacher at each school and indicated the nature of each training session. As with the teacher profiles, teacher plans were completed

for all the teachers at seven of the schools and for the same percentages of teachers as the profiles at the remaining three schools.

Criterion (3) The formative evaluators observed 19 teacher training/staff development sessions which permitted the observation of all TOTs twice with one exception in which illness of evaluators and TOT on several occasions allowed only one session to be observed. In the 11 theory/feedback/planning sessions (so designated because an integrated format was observed in each) the TOTs demonstrated generally high quality training in accordance with the criteria: theory into practice and planning which fostered RENP criteria. In the eight demonstration lessons observed, all six TOTs exemplified the skills to be taught and did utilize sufficient time to debrief with the teachers involved. However, we noticed definite individual variability among TOTs in these criteria as well as variability between different sessions of the same TOT. We judge that while each of the TOTs have been observed to meet the aforementioned standards of quality, some TOTs could improve their consistency of performance.

The TOT at each of the ten schools has recorded the activities in which teachers have participated on each teacher's training plan. Weekly reports of these activities are sent to the component director. In five of the eleven staff development sessions, the TOTs specifically encouraged the teachers to continue self-assessment. The nature of the interactive process observed between TOTs and teachers is one in which the teachers, even in the presence of the formative evaluators speak most candidly to the TOTs of their own weaknesses. We infer from such candor that a learning climate facilitative of self-evaluation has been established by the TOTs. All teachers are being asked to complete a questionnaire from the component head (who is meeting with teachers at each school to explain its purpose). They are asked to evaluate the quality of their training, the TOT's performance, and their own instructional improvement.

Criterion (4) Nine teachers were interviewed by the formative evaluators. Teachers were randomly selected and stratified by school and TOT. All were most laudatory of the nature of the training they were receiving from their TOT; they each expressed in some detail specific ways in which their teaching had been improved by the RENP sessions and displayed positive attitudes towards continued involvement with the TOT. Eight of the nine were elementary teachers and each stated that mathematics was a particularly difficult subject to teach for them or constituted their weakest area of preparation. Three of these eight specifically stated how relieved they were to have the TOT help them with their "slow" students for whose instruction they felt particularly unprepared. The single secondary teacher interviewed felt quite comfortable with her content knowledge but felt RENP was providing helpful and effective strategies to assist with getting that material over to students. All nine teachers expressed positive attitudes towards RENP and the training they were receiving from their TOTS.

The interviews with principals and assistant principals tended to substantiate the positive attitudes expressed by the teachers towards their RENP training. Principals at nine of the ten schools stated that all their teachers were now generally positive (despite initial suspicion that the RENP training somehow reflected a poor rating and need for training); the other principal stated that the majority of the teachers are now positive towards the RENP training.

To determine the competencies gained by teachers from their RENP training, the formative evaluators scrutinized the TOTs' records of teachers' training sessions. The records indicate that definite learning had occurred in order for teachers to have completed specific training modules. Two classrooms were visited to observe the instruction. The teachers demonstrated a high degree of competence in the skill area in which they had received training; yet as no baseline level of competence was known, growth cannot be inferred, only competence.

The relationship between criterion (3) and (4) must be noted here. From observations of the training sessions with 13 teachers, the formative evaluators have developed an inference regarding the level of teaching skill and content mastery of many of the teachers involved. From analyzing diagnostic information and observing students in classrooms and centers, further inferences have been made. Specifically, RENP is dealing largely with upper elementary grade teachers (10 first grade teachers, 22 secondary school teachers, and 53 fourth or fifth grade teachers) whose students are predominately two grade levels or more behind their instructional level. Furthermore, these elementary teachers in interviews, frequently expressed their own difficulties with teaching mathematics. This suggests that the TOTs are attempting to move many teachers from a very low level of teaching skills (in terms of the RENP competence criteria) to acceptable levels of teaching. Specifically, of the 13 teachers with whom the formative evaluators have interacted, 8 would have to be judged from their own statements in training sessions to be at the most rudimentary levels in relation to RENP's competence criteria. Only three could be judged knowledgeable in relation to these criteria. Thus, it seems most unlikely that high levels of competency would be demonstrated by "most teachers" (more than 50%) if more than half began at a low level (8 of 13) and had only three months of training. However, it is quite conceivable that all could show progress. The testimony of our sample suggests most did, but the extent of progress remains uncertain, due to the lack of baseline data.

An additional factor which the formative evaluators have considered in attempting to assess teacher competence or instructional improvement has been the amount of individualized training time TOTs can spend with teachers. This time is inversely proportional to the number of teachers they must serve. Also, related is the number of schools to which TOTs must travel, which partially determines their "availability" to teachers for informal assistance with materials or planning and spontaneous conferences.

There exist marked differences in the pattern of TOT assignment which we judge to affect the type and the quality of the training which TOTs can give. While the actual numbers of teachers which TOTs serve does not vary greatly, ranging from 11 to 16, when partitioned by number of schools served (meaning number of mathematics laboratories to be established and number of days accessible to teachers) quite a bit of variability is evident. Specifically, two TOTs remain full-time in a single school having one lab to establish and maintain with 13 and 16 teachers to whom they are available each day (except when they must be available for RENP staff development). Three TOTs split time between two schools; one TOT visits one of her schools only once a week and the other two TOTs split half-time in each school, each servicing 15 teachers. The remaining TOT services 14 teachers at three schools. The types of service being provided contrasting the two extremes (13 teachers in one school versus 14 in three schools) are marked; one type relegates the status of the TOT to that of a weekly visitor who works with selected teachers, the other is an integral part of the daily instructional program of that school. Our interview data support this inference regarding the schedule of service. When teachers and administrators feel the TOT is part of the school program with a daily committment, they are more cooperative, supportive and participative with the RENP program.

The difficulty which split schools causes in establishing a schedule of frequent training sessions in mathematics is compounded by having only one aide per school. Unlike Reading, with four aides per school, which can release four teachers at a single time for group sessions, Mathematics has all single teacher conferences. This makes for good individual attention but minimized the efficiency of the training, especially for theory sessions and demonstration lessons. The inability to schedule teachers for more than one session each week must have an effect on the amount of training received and instructional improvement demonstrated.

Earlier, in criterion (3), we reported the observed variability in the TOTs performance both between TOTs and within single TOTs. The variability observed between sessions taught by the same TOT occurred with TOTs whose time is split between schools but not with the TOTs who are in single schools. Such observations suggest that a fragmentation of service across schools may be affecting the diagnosis of teachers' needs, the planning of training sessions, or the interpersonal relationships between TOT and teachers (the impairment of any one of which could produce a reduced quality in training).

15. By February 15, almost all students (estimated 2,520) will have had individual profiles prepared re their strengths/weaknesses in math. An individual learning plan for each student will have been prepared with the assistance of the teacher. The April 26th review will show that the individual learning plans have been implemented. The individual student records will show what activity was undertaken, the student's progress, and what modifications were necessary to improve student learning in math.

Criteria

1. ICRT or PMT data on students will have been received from the school.
2. Individual profiles for each student will be kept on file.
3. Individual Learning Plans will have been prepared and will be kept on file.
4. The plans will have been implemented and progress recorded.

Method

Criterion (1) The printouts of test data for students were reviewed at each school with the TOT.

Criterion (2) and (3) The profiles and plans of each teacher for 10% of the students were reviewed at each school with the TOT.

Criterion (4) As described in grant term 16, a random sample of about 3% of student plans were analyzed on two occasions for the appropriateness of activities compared to plans. On a third and earlier occasion a 10% sample of student plans at each school was reviewed to determine if recording of activities and progress was being performed.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

Criterion (1) has been met in all schools.

Criterion (2) has been fully met at eight schools and partially met at two schools.

Criterion (3) has been fully met at all ten schools.

Criterion (4) has been fully met at all ten schools.

Evidence

Criterion (1) The ten schools provided test data for the TOTs to construct profiles with the teachers. However, due to student transfers during the school year and student absences, approximately 85% of the students have tests available at nine schools and only 50% available at the other. An additional 10% across schools were tested at an inappropriate level, resulting in either 100% mastery or 0% mastery.

Criterion (2) The 10% sample of student profiles at each school revealed that at eight schools all of the sampled students had completed profiles. At the other two schools 85% (17 of 20) and 75% (15 of 20) of the sampled students had completed profiles. We were told by TOTs that they had administered parts of the diagnostic tests (in accordance with the curriculum being addressed) to students for whom completed tests were unavailable. This retesting probably accounts for the fact that we found a higher percentage of completed profiles (which address current curricular areas) than school administered test data.

Criterion (3) In our samples of 10% of the students at each school all were found to contain Individual Learning Plans which for the curricular area to be taught by the teacher ennumerated the PMT skills (which correspond to the D.C.P.S. objectives) or ICRT objectives to be addressed. Since the objectives are sequenced in a behavioral heirarchy in numerical patterns, the teacher and TOT (knowing these patterns) can plan learning activities for their teaching or for the IAs' instruction.

Criterion (4) All of the sampled plans in each school showed that activities were being accurately recorded as the students' work was in their folders as well as a record of the learning activity, the objective and the date.

- There is not a uniform procedure by which the TOTs record the mastery of a given skill or objective when such has been demonstrated via a check test; each TOT has her own idiosyncratic coding procedure on either the profile or the plan to indicate mastery.

16. By February 15, almost all children will be involved in their math programs. There must be evidence that most children (accelerated as well as remedial) are being accommodated.

Criteria

1. Almost all children will be involved in their math programs
2. Most students (accelerated as well as remedial) are being accommodated:
   - learning activities in labs and classrooms provided by RENP will be appropriate for students' levels in given topics
   - enrichment activities for students who have demonstrated mastery in given topics or skill objectives will be provided

Method

We observed laboratory instruction of all IAs and interviewed all TOTs and IAs concerning the nature and scheduling of service to children.

At each school on two occasions the records of students learning activities were analyzed through partioning a 25% random sample of students into remedial, grade level, and accelerated categories according to test level and comparing activities to plans for a 10% random sample in each category.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

The grant term has been fully met at high quality in nine schools and partially met in one school.

Evidence

Criterion (1) At six of the seven elementary schools all students of each teacher are scheduled for service in the laboratory weekly and have been so attending.

At the seventh elementary school, after all students were introduced to the laboratory in the fall different grade levels have been utilizing the lab differently. This scheduling was judged in our opinion to be haphazard and has now been corrected so that since early April all students regularly attend the laboratory. At the three secondary schools, students are referred by their teachers weekly for laboratory instruction. Thus, not all students are exposed to the laboratory itself for each teacher. However, the TOTs occasionally have been able to schedule whole classes to the lab so that the TOT, teacher, and IA can simultaneously instruct students in learning centers. We observed one such occurence.

Criterion (2) In mathematics there were no students who were administered tests above their grade level or who showed a high degree of mastery (more than 75%) on the grade level tests. From our 25% samples of students at the elementary schools on the two occassions, we found 48 of 370 students (13%) tested at grade level with all others below grade level; and 56 of 358 (16%) tested at grade level. At the secondary school all sampled students were tested below grade level. The RENP program works with only applied mathematics students at the secondary level. As the partitioned group for the grade level students was relatively small, we compared activities to plans of approximately 20% of them rather than the intended 10% sample. For the below grade level students, a 10% sample was chosen for the comparison. In all cases the activities recorded were in accordance with the learning plans.

As nearly all students service could be judged remedial by the decision rule of below grade level in testing, the second aspect of criterion (2), (which necessitates considering accelerated students or those for whom enrichment in a given area, topic, or objective is appropriate) becomes significant. In each of the laboratories there exists ample activities for enrichment in all areas which the evaluators could determine. These materials are used; on over half of the lab visits made,

we observed the IAs giving enrichment assignments to a few students who either had completed the particular tasks for the day or had already mastered the objectives for a given topic and was scheduled to the lab for enrichment.

17. Activities will focus on achieving enabling objectives -- not on baseline testing, module development, etc. -- unless the math component head believes these are so vital to achieve the refunding criteria that these activities are given priority. The emphasis will be on children served, and on teacher competency. Parent training is to be deferred to Phase II unless it can be done well and still meet criteria 14, 15, and 16.

Criterion

The enabling objectives referred to in this grant term were assessed in other grant terms in this report. Thus, the criterion is: activities conducted by the RENP Mathematics Component will not include baseline testing, module development, and parent training - unless the mathematics component head thinks these activities are necessary in order to achieve the refunding criteria.

Method

All of the mathematics labs were visited twice, all of the mathematics TOTs and the head of the mathematics component were interviewed throughout the evaluation.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

The criterion has been fully met.

Evidence

Neither baseline testing, nor parent involvement were observed during the evaluators' visits to the mathematics labs, and the head of the Mathematics Component confirmed that these activities were not being conducted. The head of the Mathematics Component revealed that twelve modules were developed because they were deemed essential for training of teachers; we observed these modules being used with teachers in our visits to the mathematics labs.

18. RENP will rely primarily upon existing materials in carrying out the math component. No new curriculum will be developed in grades K-6. RENP will include an enclosure with the sixth quarterly report summarizing its review of materials; describing gaps, if any, to be filled by the "technical math" program; and plans for its pilot testing and review. With NIE's and DCPS/RENP's mutual agreement (to be received by January 15, 1976) the program will proceed to implement its plan for technical mathematics. This is, however, an option at the discretion of RENP and should be undertaken only if the other math activities can be fulfilled.

Criterion

As NIE did not approve the development of "technical math" only the following is considered: the Mathematics Component will use existing materials and no new curricula will be developed in grades K-12.

Method

Observations were completed in ten classrooms, all of the mathematics labs, nineteen staff development sessions for teachers, and seven staff development sessions for RENP employees in the Mathematics Component.

Interviews were conducted with all of the mathematics TOTs and with nine teachers.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

The grant term has been fully met.

Evidence

No new curricula development was in evidence; mathematics lab materials from Creative Teaching Associates were being used in the Mathematics Component; supplementary ideas for teachers utilized existing materials.

All of the interviews that were conducted substantiated the above findings.

19. By February 1, individualized unit task force plans will be available for all Phase I schools. By March 1, the unit task force plans will be almost fully implemented, under the oversight of the local school boards of Phase I schools.

Criteria

1. Each plan will contain clear and precise objectives, stated in measureable terms.
2. Each plan will contain a section indicating the various activities which will be undertaken by school staff to implement the objectives stated in their Unit Task Force plan.
3. Each plan will contain a time line of implementation for the objectives.
4. Each plan will ensure that those constituting the Unit Task Force will be drawn from several school-related constituencies.
5. Each plan will include current test data on RENP students.
6. Each plan will include a section delineating the way in which the Unit Task Force (or designated members) will monitor the implementation of the overall plan.

Method

Criterion (1) The objectives contained in each plan were reviewed by curriculum specialists on the evaluation team to ascertain whether or not the objectives were discrete, measureable, and contained specific criteria for measurement.

Criterion (2) Each plan was reviewed by the evaluation team to ensure that it contained statements relating to the "translation" of objectives into specific activities. Interviews were conducted with the component director in charge of mathematics and with the math TOTs to clarify the "translation" process, and to ensure that it was, in fact, occurring. Activities observed occurring at each school

were compared with those delineated in the plan to determine congruence.

Criterion (3) Each plan was reviewed to ascertain whether or not the requisite timeline had been included.

Criterion (4) Each plan was carefully reviewed by the Principal Investigator to determine who constituted the Unit Task Force in each school. Finally, Unit Task Force members delineated in each plan were interviewed by the evaluators to substantiate their participation on the Unit Task Forces, specifically, all principals and/or assistant principals, all TOTs, and COs.

Criterion (5) Each plan was reviewed by the Principal Investigator to ascertain whether or not current testing data had been included.

Criterion (6) Each plan was reviewed by the Principal Investigator to ensure that it contained a statement regarding the way in which implementation of the plans would be monitored by members of the Task Force.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

Criterion (1) has been met for each of the ten schools with a high degree of quality.

Criterion (2) has been met for each of the ten schools. The degree of quality varies between schools, though the continuum runs from "good" to "excellent". Therefore, the degree of quality is judged acceptable for all schools.

Criterion (3) has been bet, with high quality for each of the ten schools.

Criterion (4) has been fully met at each of the schools.

Criterion (5) has been fully met, with a high degree of quality at each of the schools.

Criterion (6) has been met for each of the schools. The quality of the monitoring plan, while varying for each school, is sufficient to ensure a careful check on whether or not the RENP activities delineated within the plan are being carried out.

Evidence

Criterion (1) Each of the Unit Task Force Plans pertaining to those schools having a math component has two sets of objectives: the first set, common across all plans, is comprised of five general reading objectives embodied by the Response to Educational Needs Project. One of these objectives pertains to specific teacher training outcomes in math. Two of the objectives pertain to student outcomes, and focus upon the acquisition of measurable, discrete skills, which students participating in RENP are expected to acquire. One objective pertains to TOTs and one pertains to Instructional Aides.

In addition to the five common math objectives, each Unit Task Force plan contains math objectives idiosyncratic to that particular school. In all cases, these objectives relate to specific student outcomes. Three schools also listed, as part of their own objectives, outcomes relating to teacher training. All of the individual school objectives were closely related to the common RENP objectives and differed only in the stress which they placed upon certain aspects of those objectives.

The number of school specific-objectives varied from as few as five, in one school, to as many as sixteen in another. The mean number of specific school objectives was seven.

Criterion (2) The method(s) to be utilized in implementing Unit Task Force objectives were common across all plans, and were included in a section entitled "Staff Development Utilizing the Diagnostic/Prescriptive Approach". This section, in turn, was sub-divided into three smaller sections: diagnosis, (teachers) diagnosis (students) and prescription/application. These subsections are briefly described below:

-- Diagnosis (teachers): This section clearly delineated the specific steps to be followed by each TOT in constructing individual teacher profiles. (These profiles, when completed form the basis for Teacher Training in relation

to each of the general RENP and school specific objectives.) The assessment procedures, described in detail elsewhere in this report, consisted of a "Letter of Inquiry"; personal interviews with TOTs and teachers, and observations of individual instruction by TOTs.

-- Diagnosis (students): This section briefly describes the manner in which teachers will be taught to diagnose student needs in relation to the objectives of the Unit Task Force Plan. It focuses upon the administration of diagnostic tests and the use of test data in the construction of individual student profiles. The culmination of this section addresses the generation of individualized student learning plans based on such profiles.

--Prescription/Application: This section describes, in general, the ways in which teachers will be urged to apply the skills which they have acquired from their interactions with the TOTs. The section stresses the selection of specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of individual students, and the selection of curricular material appropriate to the remediation of specific skill deficiencies.

While the staff development section of the Unit Task Force plans is common across all of the schools, different aspects of the plan are stressed at different points of time in the individual schools. This is reflected in the project timeline which is included as part of each plan, and is corroborated by repeated observations within the schools.

Criterion (3) Each of the Unit Task Force plans included a timeline delineating when each of the specific activities delineated in the plan would occur. The timelines encompassed five months (January to May) and stipulated end-dates for each aspect of the plan; for example the date by which initial diagnosis would be completed, the date by which training would begin, etc. Three of the schools also included within

their timelines dates by when specific student objectives were expected to have been accomplished. The amount of time allocated for specific activities was similar, though not identical across schools. Interviews with Unit Task Force members revealed that, in constructing the time line, the Unit Task Force considered realistic constraints, such as the number of teachers with whom the TOTs worked, the amounts of time that teachers could devote to being trained, and the baseline training needs of teachers.

Criterion (4) Each of the Unit Task Forces was comprised of the following categories of individuals: school principal (or his/her designee); form one to three teachers, a representative of the Washington Teachers' Union, the school Librarian, the Math TOT, a student, a Local Baord Member, a Reading Specialist, a Mathematics Resource Teacher, the Community Organizer, a Counselor, and the Instructional Aides. Our interviews with Unit members indicate that these constituencies are represented on the Unit Task Forces.

Criterion (5) Each plan contained current (1975/1976) test data on students serviced by RENP. Math data were collected through the use of the PMT instrument, which had been approved by the Component Director and the TOTs. In all cases, data were stratified by grade and classes, and the number for each class was reported.

Criterion (6) Each plan contained a brief narrative describing the way in which the Unit Task Force would ensure that RENP activities were being implemented. All of the plans stressed that designated Unit Task Force members would periodically review the student and teacher profiles kept by the teacher and TOTs to make sure that the latter were current. Each of the monitoring plans also stipulated that the TOT must report to the Unit Task Force each month, detailing her activities during that month. Finally, each of the palns contained a statement that the Unit Task Force, as a whole, had the right and obligation to monitor any and all activities delineated within the larger plan at any time. One of the plans stipulated that it would conduct

its own, informal survey of teachers and students to determine whether or not the latter were satisfied with the services they had been receiving from RENP.

In all but one case, the actual monitoring plans were not specific, in that they did not designate particular Unit Task Force personnel as being responsible for any given facet of the monitoring process; neither did they stipulate how they would review the contents of teacher and student profiles (i.e. what criteria would be utilized to judge the acceptability of such profiles). When we compared interview data from TOTs and COs concerning the monitoring done by the principal with the interview data from principals concerning their knowledge of RENP activities in their school (specifically or the math component) remarkable congruence was found. Five of ten principals or designated assistant principals were definitely monitoring RENP quite closely.

20. No new curriculum development will take place in the Reading Component. RENP will rely upon existing materials for this component. These may be adapted for use as appropriate.

Criterion

The reading Component will use existing materials; no new curricula will be developed.

Method

Observations were completed in 7 classrooms, in all 10 reading centers, in 24 staff development sessions for teachers, and in 7 staff development sessions for personnel in the Reading Component. In addition, interviews were conducted with all of the reading TOTs and with 25 teachers (or 21% of the 115 teachers).

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

The grant term has been fully met.

Evidence

No new currimulum development was in evidence; TOTs were observed using approved kits and materials.

The interviews that were conducted also verified that no new curricula have be developed.

21. RENP will use existing diagnostic instruments in the reading component rather than developing new ones. Informal tests designed to facilitate day-to-day classroom work will be permitted.

Criterion

TOTs will use only existing diagnostic tests.

Method

To determine if the criterion has been met, inspections of diagnostic test data and interviews of TOTs were completed.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

This grant term has been fully met.

Evidence

Approved tests are used by all TOTs. These tests include the following: ICRT, PRT, Phonics Mastery Test, Botel Word Opposite Test, Keys to Reading: Competency Skill Test, and pre-tests from reading kits. One TOT used the DCPS Word Recognition and Competency Test for Sequential Skills.

22. By February 1, almost every employee of the reading component will have been evaluated/assessed for competency in teaching reading. Incompetent personnel will be dismissed. By March 1, others will have received intensive training to bring them up to speed. The personnel records will show that this was done. Periodic checks to ensure competence is maintained should be apparent in personnel folder. TOTs, TOAs, and IAs will know what they are doing, their activities will make *educational sense, they will know why they* are conducting various activities, and perform them with high levels of competence.

Criteria

1. Almost every employee of the mathematics component will have been evaluated/assessed for competency in teaching reading.

2. Personnel will have received training for the purpose of improvement in areas of deficiency.

3. Personnel training shall have been recorded and periodically updated.

4. TOTs, TOAs, and IAs will fully understand the activities of their roles.

5. TOTs, TOAs, and IAs will perform their required activities with high levels of competence.

Method

Criteria (1) and (3) The personnel folders of all the TOTs, TOAs, and IAs were reviewed, and the Director of the Reading Component was interviewed.

Criterion (2) The training of the RENP reading staff was observed in four staff development sessions of TOTs and TOAs and three training sessions of IAs.

Criterion (4) All TOTs, TOAs, and a random sample of ten of the forty (25%) IAs were interviewed to assess their understanding of their roles as described in the

"Training Program" document.

Criterion (5) All TOTs were observed in 24 training sessions with teachers. The TOAs were observed in 3 training sessions with aides. Twenty of the forty (50%) IAs were observed instructing students in centers. In addition, 25 teachers and all 10 principals and/or assistant principals were interviewed.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

All criteria have been fully met with a high degree of quality.

Evidence

Criterion (1) Completed Staff Assessment Forms were observed for all TOTs, TOAs, and for all of the 25% sample (10 of 40) IAs in the Reading Component.

Criteria (2) and (3) Training plans exist for all TOTs, TOAs, and IAs. For TOTs and TOAs these plans specifically addressed the skills measured by the various assessment instruments, and included a description of the area in which work was needed, and at least one course for remediating weaknesses. Individualized Training Plans existed for each of the IAs, and each Training Plan was calibrated to the results of the staff assessment. The Individualized Training Plans for all TOTs, TOAs, and IAs are updated monthly, and evidence of such updating such as certification of skills in which a TOT, a TOA, or an IA was initially judged deficient were immediately apparent. The observed training sessions were commensurate with the training plans.

Criterion (4) A document entitled "Training Program/Reading Component/RENP" clearly specifies those activities to be performed by TOTs, TOAs, and IAs, along with reasons for conducting these activities. Second, all employees in the Reading Component are required to review their monthly assessment ratings as evidenced by the fact that all the examined rating sheets had been countersigned

by employees. Third, interviews conducted with TOTs, TOAs, and IAs substantiated that they are cognizant of activities they are to perform, and the reasons for conducting various activities.

Criterion (5) All of the reading TOTs were observed training teachers on two occasions (excepting one TOT who was seen only once due to hospitalization). In all cases we concluded that TOTs were performing at high levels of competence. For a detailed discussion of this latter point, the reader is referred to grant term 23.

The performance of the two TOAs was also judged to be at a high level of competence as evidenced by our visits to three training sessions the TOAs conducted for IAs.

Observations of twenty IAs in schools, and of 13 IAs presenting model learning activities in staff development sessions, indicate that they were performing their jobs competently and in accordance with their job descriptions. A further discussion of the quality of the performance of IAs appears in the writeup of grant term 30.

Finally the interview data from discussions with teachers and principals indicate that the TOTs and the IAs are performing their jobs competently.

23. By February 1, almost all teachers (estimated 171) will have been assessed for their strengths/weaknesses in teaching reading. An individual teacher learning plan will be developed, showing what activities will be undertaken to bring teachers close to 100% competency. By March 1, most teachers will have been trained. With regard to their reading activities in the classrooms, they will know what they are doing in reading, why they are doing this, and show high levels of competency in implementing activities.

Criteria

1. RENP will have developed criteria for the competency in the teaching of reading which will be used as a basis for the assessment of teachers and for their training. The criteria should be logical, specific, and understood by the TOTs to provide such a basis.

2. The assessment of teachers' skills will have been completed on almost all teachers and will have been performed in a standard and formal manner with instruments/procedures logically derived from the competency criteria.

3. The training of teachers will have been done in accordance with the training plans at a high quality:

-- theory sessions will move from theory into practice including not only stimulating concepts and ideas but also specific teaching strategies, technique and materials designed to foster instructional improvement in the RENP competency criteria areas.

-- demonstration lessons by TOTs will be of high quality, exemplifying the skills in which teachers are being trained (i.e., the competency criteria) and include appropriate debriefing (feedback) with teachers.

-- TOTs and teachers will engage in planning for teachers' new instruction, fostering instructional improvement in the RENP competency criteria areas.

-- TOTs will foster interactive planning and sharing among teachers.

Has the Grant Term Been Met?

Criterion (1) has been fully met with a high degree of quality.

Criterion (2) has been fully met in eight of the schools, with a high degree of quality. The other two schools have only partially met this criterion although what was done showed high quality.

Criterion (3) has been fully met at all schools with a high degree of quality.

Criterion (4) is judged upon limited evidence. As reflected in the formative evaluation plan, the assessment of teacher competence with classroom observation might not be fully realized; more observations were planned and desired but only four could be scheduled. The interview and documentary data do suggest strongly that progress in performance and positive changes in attitude have been affected by the project. The extent of change in teachers performance remains in question.

Evidence

Criterion (1) The following competency criteria have been developed by RENP for the teaching of reading:

-- teachers will be able to use a diagnostic/prescriptive approach in personalizing student instruction (i.e., will be able to administer and analyze diagnostic tests, plan for individual and group instruction based on diagnostic information of students' skills through identification of specific objectives needed, provide necessary teacher prescription for individuals or groups).

-- teachers will be able to incorporate the teaching of reading skills into all content areas (elementary teachers) and in their single content area (secondary).

-- teachers will be able to mesh students' skill development and functional applications

These criteria are both logical and specific in terms of RENP's goals. All TOTs interviewed understood these competencies were the basis of the teacher training program.

Criterion (2) The RENP Reading TOTs sent Letters of Inquiry (a teacher self-assessment form) to all 115 teachers. The first four questions of this form directly relate to the first teacher competency criterion of RENP (diagnostic/prescriptive teaching). The remaining questions relate to the other two competency criteria with three questions asking the teacher to describe the current instructional program and additional questions asking the teacher to rank preferences for approaches or topics to increase his/her effectiveness in the training sessions. At eight of the ten schools forms completed for all teachers were in evidence; at the other three schools one or two teachers' forms were not. In two schools 10 of 12 (83%), and 7 of 10 (70%) of the teachers' completed forms were available.

The TOT followed up the Letter of Inquiry with an individual conference with each of the teachers to plan for the TOT to observe the teacher and his/her class during instruction. After this observation they again conferred to develop a mutually agreeable set of areas for training/staff development. The weekly reports submitted by the TOTs to the component head were reviewed by the formative evaluators. These reports showed that all TOTs both observed and conferred with all their teachers with the exception of one school; a TOT who was split between two schools (filling in where a TOT had resigned) had not been able to observe all teachers (only six of ten were observed). At this one school, all ten had been conferred with, however.

Seven of the TOTs, early in their negotiations with teachers, utilized the diagnostic information from the teachers own classes to help determine areas of